

Appl. No. 10/825,986

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Each of the outstanding claims (2-4 and 7-9) stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Griffioen. In light of the following remarks, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Griffioen is directed toward a system for equalizing the potential between a tanker 1 and a pier 2. In particular, Griffioen teaches a system for preventing sparks, generated while connecting pipes on the tanker 1, from igniting light flammable materials. This is generally accomplished by equalizing the electrical potential between the tanker 1 and the pier 2 using an equalizing cable 3. The innovation in Griffioen apparently lies in a decision circuit 11 that indicates the quality of the connection of an equalizing cable 3 and decide whether to connect a transport pipe (for the hazardous material) to the ship 1.

To accomplish this goal, several measurements are made. A voltage detector 8 measures the voltage difference between the ship 1 and the pier 2. A current detector 5 measures the current on the equalizing cable 3. A processing circuit 7, in one embodiment a subtracting circuit, outputs a signal dependant on the output of the voltage detector 8 and the current detector 5.

The output of the system appears to indicate whether the connection of the equalizing cable 3 to the ship 1 is adequate to prevent sparks from flying when the transport pipe is connected or disconnected.

Taking claim 2 as an example, the present invention includes:

- a probe tip connected to a source and a ground of the device under test;
- a cable including a first electrical connection carrying a signal representative of the source from the probe tip to the measurement device and a second electrical connection connecting the ground of the device under test to the ground of the measurement device; and
- active circuitry identifying a voltage drop between the ground of the device under test and the ground of the measurement device and correcting the signal for the voltage drop prior to reaching the measurement device.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appl. No. 10/825,986

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102(b), the cited reference must teach each and every limitation of a claim for a *prima facie* case of anticipation.

Applicants respectfully submit that there is no probe tip as set forth in claim 2. The term probe tip is generally associated with bench-top test instruments, such as those set forth in claim 9. Examples of probe tips may be found at:

www.agilent.com/find/logic_analyzer_probes

Additionally, the first element of claim 2 calls for a connection to a source and a ground of the device under test. It is important to note that in FIG. 1 of Griffioen, the ground symbol (element 2) is the pier.

Presumably the device under test is either just the ship 1 or the ship 1 and the pier 2. If the device under test is just the ship, there is no connection to a source and a ground rather both connections at clamps 6 and 10 are simply to the metal of the ship 1 – no differentiation is made as between signal and ground. Thus, the device under test must be the system of the ship 1 and the pier 2. If this is the case, there is no teaching in Griffioen identifying a voltage drop between the ground of the device under test and the ground of the measurement device as the voltage detector 8 detects a voltage between the ship 1 and the pier 2 while the current detector 5 outputs a voltage representative of the current between the ship 1 and the pier 2 over the equalization cable 3.

Moreover, Griffioen does not “correct” the signal for the voltage drop prior to reaching the measurement device. In this case the term “correct” refers to eliminating the effect of any measured voltage drop between the ground of the device under test and the measurement system.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Griffioen fails to teach each and every limitation of independent claim 2. Further, applications respectfully submit that independent claims 7 and 8 contain similar limitations that are similarly absent from Griffioen. With respect to dependant claim 9, Applicants note that Griffioen

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appl. No. 10/825,986

does not teach or suggest any one of: "an oscilloscope, a spectrum analyzer, a network analyzer, a logic analyzer, a counter, and a time interval meter."

In accordance with the foregoing it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance, such action being earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining informalities to be addressed, it is believed that the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such informalities can expedite prosecution.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 50-1078.

Respectfully submitted,
AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES

Date: April 11, 2005

AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES
Legal Department, DL 429
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 7599
Loveland, CO 80537-0599

By: 

Gerald P. Joyce III
Registration No. 37,648
(978) 681-2405

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile
Transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office of the date
Shown below.

Date of facsimile: April 11, 2005

Typed Name: Gerald P. Joyce III

Signature: 

BEST AVAILABLE COPY